

Aaron M. Bartell
direct tel (202) 974-5638
facsimile (202) 974-6738
abartell@chadbournel.com

January 31, 2010

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Connect America Fund
WC Docket No. 10-90
Notice of Ex Parte

Dear Ms. Dortch:

Today, the undersigned and James Stenger, on behalf of San Juan Cable LLC d/b/a OneLink Communications, met with Zac Katz, legal advisor to Chairman Genachowski, to discuss the substance of the enclosed memorandum.

Should additional information be necessary in connection with this matter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
/s/ Aaron M. Bartell

Aaron M. Bartell

Counsel to San Juan Cable LLC d/b/a
OneLink Communications

Enclosure

cc: Zac Katz

**San Juan Cable LLC d/b/a OneLink Communications
Meeting With Regard to the Connect America Fund
WC Docket No. 10-90**

January 31, 2011

Executive Summary

- OneLink – a cable, broadband Internet and interconnected VoIP service provider in Puerto Rico – is deeply concerned about the public interest and competitive effects of PRT’s campaign for substantial amounts of additional broadband support
- In the upcoming Connect America Fund NPRM, the Commission should seek comment to clarify the record with respect to (1) PRT’s contradictory statements regarding the existence of a business case for broadband deployment in Puerto Rico and (2) PRT’s claimed need for additional broadband funds
- Over the past 14 months, PRT has engaged in an extensive lobbying effort to gain additional federal subsidies for its deployment of broadband in Puerto Rico
 - The central theme of PRT’s campaign is that it needs additional funding because there is no private sector business case for broadband on the island without it
 - PRT has proposed two initiatives that will give it money to purportedly solve the problem: (1) a non-rural insular high-cost mechanism, and (2) a “pilot program” under the Connect America Fund
- Contrary to PRT’s representations to the Commission, PRT has developed and begun to implement a business plan for profitably deploying broadband facilities in Puerto Rico
 - PRT has been building a broadband-capable IPTV system since late 2007
 - In its franchise application, PRT presented to the Telecommunications Regulatory Board of Puerto Rico (TRB) a 5-year business plan showing that PRT can profitably deploy broadband to nearly half of Puerto Rico for \$101 million
 - PRT also represented to the TRB that it will fund this investment out of its operating revenues, without support from its parent company
- PRT’s ultimate parent company, América Móvil, must still invest at least \$160 million in telecom and broadband facilities by 2012 under its \$1 billion investment commitment
 - PRT claims to have invested approximately \$580 million in wireline facilities since 2007, including \$345 million in broadband, data and video
 - The Commission has previously concluded that this investment commitment effectively disqualifies PRT from receiving additional high-cost support
- PRT’s revenues (including projected video revenues), investment from América Móvil, and existing universal service support likely eliminate any basis for PRT to receive additional broadband support

I. Introduction

San Juan Cable LLC d/b/a OneLink Communications (“OneLink”), a provider of cable, broadband Internet, and interconnected VoIP services in San Juan, Puerto Rico and a competitor of Puerto Rico Telephone Company, Inc. (“PRT”) with respect to each of those services, respectfully submits this *ex parte* in order to inform the Commission of a significant discrepancy between PRT’s representations on the record in the above-referenced proceeding and PRT’s representations to the Telecommunications Regulatory Board of Puerto Rico (the “TRB”) regarding PRT’s business plan for profitable deployment of broadband in Puerto Rico without the need for external funding.

In light of this discrepancy, OneLink respectfully requests that the Commission seek comment to clarify the record regarding the existence of a business case for broadband deployment in Puerto Rico and PRT’s ability to invest in broadband without new federal funding before the Commission adopts any proposal that would grant additional subsidies to PRT. At a minimum, the Commission should request PRT to explain the disparity between its statements to the Commission and to the TRB. The Commission should also ensure that OneLink and other broadband providers have an opportunity to obtain financial support for broadband that PRT itself admits it does not need.

II. PRT’s Statements – and Omissions – to the Commission Regarding Broadband Deployment in Puerto Rico have Distorted the Record in this Proceeding

Since November 2009, PRT has waged a multi-pronged campaign at the Commission – consisting of 3 comments, 2 reply comments, a petition for reconsideration, a petition for waiver, 2 requests for review and no less than 32 *ex parte* presentations, across 6 separate dockets¹ – to obtain (or retain) federal universal service subsidies for the ostensible purpose of spurring broadband development in Puerto Rico. In support of these efforts, PRT has told the Commission repeatedly that “there is no business case for private investment in broadband deployment in unserved areas in Puerto Rico,”² that it cannot secure credit for such development efforts,³ and that “deployment of broadband in Puerto Rico [is thus] generally uneconomic in most areas without federal funding.”⁴

PRT proposes two solutions to this problem: (1) the Commission should create a new non-rural insular high cost mechanism that would give PRT approximately \$33 million per year for broadband-capable telephone infrastructure; or (2) the Commission should create a new

¹ See n.23, *infra*.

² Comments of P.R. Tel. Co., Inc. at 13, Connect America Fund; A National Broadband Plan for Our Future: High-Cost Universal Service Support, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 05-337 (Jul. 12, 2010) (the “PRT CAF Comments”).

³ See PRT CAF Comments at 8.

⁴ See, e.g., Letter from Nancy Victory, counsel to PRT, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary of the Commission, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 10-52 (Dec. 7, 2010).

“pilot program” for the Connect America Fund (“CAF”) that would give PRT millions of dollars to deploy broadband infrastructure.⁵ In short, PRT’s suggestions for remedying the broadband availability gap in Puerto Rico boil down to the Commission creating programs that give PRT – and only PRT – money.

However, neither these proposals nor PRT’s attempts to justify them accurately represent the status of broadband deployment in Puerto Rico or PRT’s purported need for additional funding. First, PRT has failed to notify the Commission of the fact that it has an existing business plan to profitably deploy broadband-capable facilities to a substantial portion of Puerto Rico within 5 years (and the remainder of the island as quickly as possible), without the need for subsidies or even outside investment. Second, PRT ignores its substantial existing investment commitment, which the Commission has concluded effectively disqualifies PRT from receiving new subsidies. The Commission must request comment regarding these issues to clarify the record before adopting any proposal that would grant additional support to PRT.

A. PRT’s Business Plan to Profitably Deploy Broadband in Puerto Rico Contradicts PRT’s Claims that Such Deployment is Uneconomic

The lack of a business case for deploying broadband throughout Puerto Rico is the central theme underlying PRT’s insistence that it requires “immediate financial assistance to overcome the dearth of broadband investment and deployment on the island.”⁶ PRT even claims to have “invested significant financial and personnel resources over the last several years to determine how broadband could be deployed throughout Puerto Rico,” allegedly without success.⁷ However, PRT’s representations to the Commission in this regard are directly contradicted by its statements to the TRB. PRT has *for years* represented to the TRB that PRT can profitably deploy broadband-capable facilities to a substantial portion of Puerto Rico within 5 years and that it can finance such deployment using only its operating revenues.⁸

PRT has been building an Internet Protocol television (“IPTV”) system modeled on AT&T’s U-verse service since at least late 2007. In its application for a cable franchise for that IPTV service, which is pending before the TRB, PRT states that it “has prepared a business plan for the [broadband-capable] IPTV project projecting costs and revenues over a 5 year period. As shown by the plan, the service is expected to become profitable in the fifth year.”⁹ PRT claims that it will have broadband facilities capable of serving nearly half of Puerto Rico by the end of

⁵ See, e.g., Letter from Nancy Victory, counsel to PRT, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary of the Commission, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 10-52 (Dec. 7, 2010).

⁶ PRT CAF Comments at 7.

⁷ *Id.* at 14.

⁸ See, e.g., PRT Application for Authorization to Provide Video Service at 3, 20, Ex. 14 (confidential), Case No. JRT-2008-CCG-0002 (Dec. 11, 2008).

⁹ *Id.* at 20.

the initial 5-year period, at a cost of just over \$100 million.¹⁰ Moreover, PRT has asserted that it will require no outside funding – not even investment from América Móvil – to finance this project; rather, “PRT will fund [the \$101 million] cash requirement through its earnings.”¹¹

Attached hereto as **EXHIBIT A** is a comparison of statements PRT has made to the Commission and statements it has made to the TRB with regard to broadband deployment in Puerto Rico and related matters.

As a result of PRT’s omission of material information from its statements to the Commission, as well as the flatly contradictory statements it has made to another regulatory body, the record in this proceeding is inaccurate and incomplete.¹² The National Broadband Plan proposes that “CAF support levels should be based on what is necessary to induce a private firm to serve an area.”¹³ Despite PRT’s insistence to the Commission that deploying broadband in Puerto Rico is uneconomic without support, PRT’s business plan for profitable deployment of broadband-capable facilities in Puerto Rico – and its substantial work on that plan over the past several years – clearly demonstrate that PRT needs no inducement to serve substantial portions of the island.

In light of that fact, the Commission should seek comment to set the record straight regarding the existence of a business case for broadband deployment in Puerto Rico and PRT’s ability to invest in broadband without new broadband support. At a minimum, the Commission should request PRT to explain the disparity between its statements to the Commission and to the TRB.

B. PRT’s Investment Under the \$1 Billion Commitment and Its Existing High-Cost Support Refute PRT’s Alleged Inability to Deploy Broadband

The Commission has already concluded that PRT’s obligation to invest \$1 billion in telecommunications and broadband infrastructure in Puerto Rico over five years “substantially diminished, if not extinguished” PRT’s “claim that it cannot invest in its network without additional high-cost support.”¹⁴ Indeed, in its reply comments in the insular proceeding, PRT bragged about its network investments under that commitment, including \$395 million in

¹⁰ Id. at 3. PRT claims that it will continue rolling out the service to the rest of the island after the initial 5-year period “unless PRT finds that it can deploy on a more accelerated basis.” Id.

¹¹ PRT’s Motion to Submit Witness Testimony at Attach. 11, p. 5, Case No. JRT-2008-CCG-0002 (May 20, 2009) (the “PRT Testimony”).

¹² See Exhibit A.

¹³ See Federal Communications Commission, Connecting America: The National Broadband Plan, 145 (Mar. 16, 2010) (“National Broadband Plan”).

¹⁴ Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at ¶ 29, High-Cost Universal Service Support; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link-Up, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 03-109 (Apr. 16, 2010) (the “Insular Order”).

wireline infrastructure,¹⁵ which is precisely the investment activity that the Commission found to have eliminated PRT's need for additional high-cost support. At the same time, PRT was the twelfth highest recipient of high-cost universal service support between 2007 and 2009, despite unusually low disbursements in 2009 as a result of an accounting true-up.¹⁶ PRT's 2010 high-cost disbursements returned to their previous high level, totaling over \$92 million.¹⁷

Attached hereto as **EXHIBIT B** is a summary of PRT's investment under its commitment to date and a break-down of PRT's 2010 high-cost disbursements.

Throughout this proceeding, PRT has tried to distance itself from the limitless resources of its parent companies,¹⁸ and to downplay the impact of its existing universal service support.¹⁹ However, the Commission's CAF proposal in the National Broadband Plan contemplates basing any new broadband support only on the "net gap," *e.g.*, forward looking costs less revenues.²⁰ As proposed, the revenue portion of the equation would include all revenues from broadband-capable infrastructure (including video), as well as "funding from other sources."²¹ There is no question that investment from a parent company and existing federal subsidies qualify as "funding from other sources," and they must therefore be factored into any determination of whether a "net gap" exists for broadband funding purposes.

The Commission should therefore seek comment on whether PRT's investment commitment also "substantially diminish[es], if not extinguish[es]" PRT's need for broadband funding and/or whether the remaining investments under PRT's commitment and its existing universal service support eliminate any "net gap" on which to base additional support.

¹⁵ Reply Comments of P.R. Tel. Co., Inc. at 8-9, High-Cost Universal Service Support; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link-Up, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 03-109 (Jun. 22, 2010) (the "PRT Insular Reply Comments"). Since those reply comments were filed, PRT has submitted two additional investment reports asserting that PRT has now invested approximately \$580 million in wireline infrastructure under the commitment. See Exhibit B, Sec. A.

¹⁶ See Federal Communications Commission Response to United States House of Representatives Committee on Energy and Commerce Universal Service Fund Data Request of June 15, 2010 at Part 1 (Jun. 30, 2010).

¹⁷ See Exhibit B, Sec. B.

¹⁸ See PRT CAF Comments at n.35.

¹⁹ Id. at 15. In fact, PRT asserts that it needs *both* its existing high-cost support *and* new broadband support in order to make broadband deployment economically viable.

²⁰ National Broadband Plan at 145.

²¹ Id.

III. Broadband Subsidies in Puerto Rico Should Focus on Enabling Broadband Adoption, Especially in Areas Where Broadband Infrastructure is Available

While PRT pays lip service to the notion that broadband support should be available to broadband providers in Puerto Rico generally,²² it is clear that the thrust of PRT's extensive lobbying campaign²³ is to obtain funds only for itself to subsidize its investment in broadband-capable infrastructure.²⁴ However, in denying PRT's proposed insular mechanism, the Commission previously concluded that "PRT has not shown that...providing additional high-cost support would have any direct impact on facilities deployment or subscribership levels."²⁵ PRT has again made no such showing in this proceeding.

In the *Insular Order*, the Commission reiterated its earlier finding that "low-income support – *not* high-cost support – is the federal program best suited to address issues of affordability and subscribership in Puerto Rico."²⁶ The Commission should seek comment on whether this conclusion applies equally to broadband, particularly in areas where broadband-capable infrastructure is in place but penetration remains low. PRT itself acknowledges that "[low-income] programs are most effective where facilities to provide services have already been constructed."²⁷ Extending such programs to cover broadband would allow low-income customers who currently have access to broadband facilities – but cannot afford the service – to purchase service from the provider of their choice.

²² See, e.g., Letter from Nancy Victory, counsel to PRT, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary of the Commission, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51 (Jan. 4, 2011) (stating that "the Commission should establish a pilot program that efficiently distributes funding to advanced broadband providers in Puerto Rico..." (emphasis added)).

²³ See Chronology of PRT 2009–2011 USF/Broadband Support Campaign, attached as Exhibit C.

²⁴ This is consistent with PRT's campaign for a non-rural insular high-cost mechanism, where PRT purported to argue on behalf of all insular areas despite being the only incumbent carrier that would qualify for support. See, e.g., Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, In re Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; High-Cost Universal Service Support, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, at ¶ 34 (Dec. 9, 2005).

²⁵ Order and Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at ¶ 30, High-Cost Universal Service Support; Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service; Lifeline and Link-Up, WC Docket No. 05-337, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 03-109 (Apr. 16, 2010).

²⁶ Id. at ¶ 34.

²⁷ PRT CAF Comments at 10.

EXHIBIT A

A. PRT BROADBAND REPRESENTATIONS: FCC v. STATE REGULATORS

All PRT representations to the FCC below are from PRT's Comments in response to the Connect America Fund NOI & NPRM, and all representations to the TRB are from PRT's pending franchise application, unless otherwise noted.

	PRT Representations to the FCC	PRT Representations to the TRB
Existence of Business Case for Broadband Deployment Throughout Puerto Rico	<p>"Without additional, targeted broadband funding...there is no business case for private investment in broadband deployment in unserved areas in Puerto Rico." [p. 13]</p> <p>"PRT already has invested significant financial and personnel resources over the last several years to determine how broadband could be deployed throughout Puerto Rico. Unfortunately...PRT has been unable to establish a viable business case for broadband across the entire island without support from the universal service fund." [p. 14]</p>	<p>"PRT has prepared a business plan for the [broadband-capable] IPTV project projecting costs and revenues over a 5 year period. As shown by the plan, the service is expected to become profitable in the fifth year." [p. 20]</p> <p>"Over the course of the 18-year franchise term, PRT intends to roll out [broadband-capable] video services to the 76 municipalities of the island of Puerto Rico where PRT has suitable facilities." [p. 3]</p>
Unavailability of Credit vs. No Need for Credit	<p>"...[S]ecuring credit – to develop and expand broadband infrastructure in Puerto Rico is very difficult." [p. 8]</p> <p>"...[B]roadband providers – and the investment community – are reluctant to invest heavily in broadband in Puerto Rico because of the unique operational expenses of providing service in an isolated and tropical area." [p. 12]</p> <p>"With Puerto Rican banks struggling, broadband providers...find it difficult to secure funding for projects in Puerto Rico." [p. 11]</p>	<p>"PRT has the financial wherewithal to support the necessary investments and expenditures for [PRT's broadband-capable IPTV system]." [Exec. Summary]</p> <p>"Over the 5-year projection period the combined negative cash flow from operations and investments for the [broadband-capable IPTV] project total just over \$100 million.... PRT will fund this cash requirement through its earnings." [PRT's Motion to Submit Witness Testimony at Attach. 11, p. 5, Case No. JRT-2008-CCG-0002 (May 20, 2009) ("PRT Testimony").]</p>
Need for Federal Funding for Deployment or Improvement of Communications Infrastructure	<p>"Puerto Rico plainly needs funding to support the build out and/or upgrading of communications infrastructure." [Letter from Nancy Victory, counsel to PRT, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary of the Commission, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51 (Jan. 4, 2011)]</p>	<p>"In connection with the [broadband-capable IPTV] roll-out, PRT plans to invest approximately \$107 million over the next 5 years in fiber and copper network upgrades, further broadband deployment and Internet-based technologies. Because PRT will provide [IPTV] over its existing telecom infrastructure, many of the upgrades and improvements resulting from this new investment will benefit PRT's regulated services as well." [Exec. Summary]</p>

	PRT Representations to the FCC	PRT Representations to the TRB
Economic Justification for Deploying Broadband	<p>“...[D]eployment of broadband in Puerto Rico [is] generally uneconomic in most areas without federal funding.” [Letter from Nancy Victory, counsel to PRT, to Marlene Dortch, Secretary of the Commission, CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 10-52 (Dec. 7, 2010)]</p> <p>“Without some ability to project higher subscription rates or predictable subsidization of the construction and maintenance of facilities, the economics of deploying infrastructure to poor unserved areas simply foreclose construction of the facilities.” [p. 10]</p>	<p>“PRT plans to offer service to 45.8% of the total households (homes passed) in at least 50 municipalities within 5 years.... Service will continue to be deployed to the remaining municipalities following this initial deployment phase, unless PRT finds that it can deploy on a more accelerated basis.” [p. 3]</p> <p>“PRT plans to offer [broadband-capable] service to 43 low-income communities in the first year alone.” [Exec. Summary]</p> <p>“PRT commits that – not only will it not discriminate in deploying service based on the income of a particular area – but it will in fact enhance competition in many such cases by deploying the first wireline-based video service [which is also broadband-capable].” [p. 4]</p> <p>“The annual revenues were determined by applying an estimated average revenue per customer to the average number of customers that are expected to be served during each year of operation. The number of customers was determined by considering the area served by the [broadband-capable IPTV] network and the likely penetration of the market that would occur in each of those areas.... The average revenue per customer was derived by considering the mix of service packages that PRT would provide and by estimating the percentage of the customer base that would subscribe to each of these packages.” [PRT Testimony, at Attach. 11, p. 3]</p> <p>“...[T]he service is expected to become profitable in the fifth year.” [p. 20]</p>

EXHIBIT B

A. PRT PURPORTED INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT – 2007 - 2010

	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
POTS	\$56,144,749	\$63,033,724	\$47,588,236	\$68,194,567	\$234,961,276
Broadband/Data	\$45,608,034	\$67,027,017	\$108,931,172 ¹	\$71,061,163 ²	\$112,635,051 – \$292,627,386
Video	Unreported	\$52,037,243			\$52,037,243 – \$232,029,578
Wireless	\$87,740,811	\$68,840,528	\$51,949,767	\$49,509,458	\$258,040,564
TOTAL	\$189,493,594	\$250,938,512	\$208,469,175	\$188,765,188	\$837,666,469

Source: America Movil Annual Progress Report for the Deployment of Infrastructure Used to Provide Basic Telephone and Broadband Services in Puerto Rico, WT Docket No. 06-113 (Apr. 4, 2008; Jul. 8, 2009; Dec. 21, 2010; Dec. 31, 2010).

B. PRT 2010 HIGH-COST UNIVERSAL SERVICE DISBURSEMENTS

	2010 High-Cost Disbursements
PRT (Central)	\$6,996,693
PRT	\$38,918,358
PRT Wireless	\$46,091,439
TOTAL	\$92,006,490

Source: <http://www.usac.org/hc/tools/disbursements/default.aspx>

¹ Unlike the 2008 report, the amount invested specifically in video is redacted in the 2009 report. As a result, each of the broadband/data and video totals reflects a range from 0% of the 2009 investment up to 100% of the 2009 investment.

² As with the 2009 report, the 2010 preliminary report does not separately identify the amount invested in video. Thus, each of the broadband/data and video totals reflects a range from 0% of the 2010 investment up to 100% of the 2010 investment.

EXHIBIT C

Chronology of PRT 2009 – 2011 USF/Broadband Support Campaign

The chart below provides a timeline of PRT's actions between November 2009 and the present in CC Docket No. 96-45, WC Docket No. 05-337, WC Docket No. 10-90, GN Docket No. 09-51, WC Docket No. 10-52, and WC Docket No. 08-71 to obtain or retain USF support or new broadband support, as well as relevant FCC actions in those dockets.

Date	Event
November 12, 2009	PRT meets with Commission staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (<i>ex parte</i>)
November 16, 2009	PRT meets with Commissioner Baker's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (11.17.09 <i>ex parte</i>)
November 17, 2009	PRT meets with Commissioner Clyburn's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (<i>ex parte</i>)
November 30, 2009	PRT meets with Commission staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (12.1.09 <i>ex parte</i>)
December 3, 2009	PRT meets with Chairman Genachowski's staff (and other Commission staff) re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (12.4.09 <i>ex parte</i>)
December 17, 2009	PRT meets with Commissioner Copps' staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (<i>ex parte</i>)
January 5, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner McDowell's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (<i>ex parte</i>)
January 26, 2010	PRT files Petition for Waiver of structural separations between LEC and LD affiliates
January 28, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Clyburn's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (<i>ex parte</i>)
February 19, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Copps re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (2.22.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
March 4, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Clyburn re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (3.5.10 <i>ex parte</i>)

Date	Event
March 11, 2010	<p>PRT meets with Commissioner Baker re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (3.12.10 <i>ex parte</i>)</p> <p>PRT meets with Commissioner McDowell re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (3.12.10 <i>ex parte</i>)</p> <p>PRT meets with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations (3.12.10 <i>ex parte</i>)</p>
March 16, 2010	FCC releases the National Broadband Plan
March 17, 2010	PRT meets with Chairman Genachowski's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (3.18.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
March 29, 2010	PRT has call with Commissioner Copps' staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (3.30.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
April 1, 2010	<p>PRT meets with Commissioner Copps re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (4.2.10 <i>ex parte</i>)</p> <p>PRT meets with Commissioner Clyburn re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (4.2.10 <i>ex parte</i>)</p>
April 9 – 12, 2010	PRT has calls with Commissioner Clyburn's staff re: pending NPRM that tentatively proposes creation of an insular high-cost mechanism (4.12.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
April 16, 2010	FCC releases the <i>Insular Order</i> , rejecting its tentative proposal to create an insular mechanism, and instead proposing increases in Link-Up support in Puerto Rico
April 21, 2010	FCC releases <i>Connect America Fund NOI and NPRM</i>
April 27, 2010	PRT files Petition for Reconsideration of the <i>Insular Order</i>
June 7, 2010	PRT files Comments on the <i>Insular NPRM</i> , opposing increase in Link-Up support
June 22, 2010	PRT files Reply Comments re: OneLink's Opposition to PRT's Petition for Reconsideration of the denial of the <i>Insular Order</i>
June 24, 2010	PRT meets with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations (<i>ex parte</i>)
July 12, 2010	PRT files Comments on the <i>Connect America Fund NOI and NPRM</i>
July 20, 2010	FCC releases <i>Sixth Broadband Deployment Report</i> and 2008 <i>High-Speed Broadband Report</i>

Date	Event
July 28, 2010	PRT files <i>ex parte</i> presentation re: waiver of structural separations that (1) provides data re: PRT's alleged lack of market power; (2) commits to comply with the same conditions applied to BOCs upon elimination of structural separations; (3) commits to continue to comply with certain other regulatory obligations
August 6, 2010	FCC releases <i>Seventh Broadband Deployment NOI</i>
August 11, 2010	PRT files Reply Comments on <i>Connect America Fund NOI and NPRM</i>
September 7, 2010	PRT files Comments on <i>Seventh Broadband Deployment NOI</i> PRT meets with Commission staff, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (9.8.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
September 8, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Clyburn, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (9.9.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
September 10, 2010	PRT meets with Chairman Genachowski's staff, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (9.13.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
September 27, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner McDowell, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (9.28.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
September 29, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Baker, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (9.30.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
October 4, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Baker's staff, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (10.5.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
October 14, 2010	PRT meets with Commissioner Copps, asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (10.15.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
November 9, 2010	PRT meets with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations (11.10.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
November 17, 2010	PRT files <i>ex parte</i> presentation including a supplemental declaration of Adail Ortiz, PRT's CFO, re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations
November 30, 2010	PRT has a call with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations, discussing competitive data re: market for business telecom in PR (12.3.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
December 6, 2010	PRT files Request for Review of USAC decision finding overpayment of USF to PRT PRT meets with Chairman Genachowski's staff (and other Commission staff), asserting that broadband deployment in PR is uneconomical (12.7.10 <i>ex parte</i>)

Date	Event
December 7, 2010	PRT has call with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations, discussing whether the Commission has authority to waive tariffing rules (12.9.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
December 17, 2010	PRT has call with Commission staff re: Petition for Waiver of structural separations, discussing regulation of local telephone service in PR and certain calling plans offered by PRT and PRT Long Distance (12.20.10 <i>ex parte</i>)
December 23, 2010	FCC grants PRT Petition for Waiver of structural separations between LEC and LD affiliates, subject to accounting conditions
January 4, 2011	PRT files <i>ex parte</i> presentation citing “Speed Matters” report claiming that 90% of PR residents have Internet speeds below Commission target minimums, as further evidence that broadband will languish in PR without broadband support
January 11, 2011	PRT files Request for Review of USAC decision finding overpayment of USF to PRT